

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1, 8-9, 11-13, 15, 18, 21, and 22 have been amended to more particularly point out what the Applicants believe to be the invention.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,305 of Ulvinen et al. (“Ulvinen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,237,096 of Bisbee et al. (“Bisbee”). Applicants respectfully submit that the combination does not disclose or suggest each and every element as amended.

Ulvinen discloses “assuming for example that the user wishes to access his account at the bank 38D, the SFR [speech recognition function] 29 signals back to the mobile station 10 a randomly selected word to be spoken by the user, via the network 37, network interface 36, and wireless system 32. The user speaks the word and, in one embodiment, the spectral and temporal characteristics of the user’s utterance are transmitted from the mobile station 10 as a digital data stream (not as speech per se) to the SRF 29 of the bank 38D for processing and comparison.”

Bisbee discloses a document authentication system (DAS) that identifies an originator of an electronic document and provides irrevocable proof of the integrity of the electronic document.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination does not disclose or suggest the element of “sending, by the device over a voice network, the private access information to a different remote source to enable the authorized user to access remote

data on the different remote source,” as amended in claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 21. Rather, the combination discloses that the SRF 29, after processing the user’s speech signal, signals the bank 38D that the user is either authorized or is not authorized. The SRF 29 signaling the bank is not the same as the user device sending the private access information to a different remote source to enable the authorized user to access remote data, as claimed in the amended claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination does not disclose or suggest each and every element as claimed in claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 21. Claims 2-7, 10, 14, 16-20, and 22-23 are dependent on at least one of claims 1, 9, 13, 15, or 21, and are patentable at least for the reasons stated above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejections to claims 1-23 under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666
for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 1 2004



André Gibbs
Reg. No. 47,593

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300